UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/544,116	10/04/2005	Luc Moens	22.32-WO-US	8632
8015 CYTEC INDUS	7590 08/24/200 STRIES INC.	EXAMINER		
1937 WEST M.		LISTVOYB, GREGORY		
P.O. BOX 60 STAMFORD, CT 06904-0060			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	10/544,116	MOENS ET AL.	
interview Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GREGORY LISTVOYB	1796	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
(1) <u>GREGORY LISTVOYB</u> .	(3) <u>Hilda Schoofs</u> .		
(2) <u>Charles Bell</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 18 August 2009.			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2	2)∏ applicant's representative	e]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>29-41</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed:			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that Mosufficient specificity (Applicant cited MPEP 2131.03) Exam NPG encompass the ranges claimed in claim 29. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE AINTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW ON THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW DATE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW DATE.	ens and Kaplan do not disclostiner disagrees. Moens's and Kaplan do not disclostiner disagrees. Moens's and Kaplan do not disclostiner disagrees. Moens's and Kaplan disagrees. Moens's and Kaplan disagrees. Moens along the last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, Moens and the last Office action has already of ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, Moens and the last Office action has already of ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, Moens and the last Office action has already of the last Office action has all the last Office action has already of the last Office action has all the last Office a	sed claimed rang (aplan's ranges for reed would render yould render the SUBSTANCE (been filed, APP ODAYS FROM TOWHICHEVER IS	ges with for IPA and er the claims claims OF THE LICANT IS THIS LATER, TO
/GREGORY LISTVOYB/ Examiner, Art Unit 1796			

Application No.

Applicant(s)